UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

LIFESCAN, INC. and JOHNSON & JOHNSON,) Case No.: 12-CV-06360
Plaintiffs,) ORDER DENYING STIPULATION RE:) CASE SCHEDULING
VS.	
SHASTA TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, PHARMATECH SOLUTIONS, INC., DECISION DIAGNOSTICS CORP. and CONDUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	

The parties have submitted a stipulation and proposed order requesting that the Court set a deadline of January 28, 2013 for Plaintiffs to file responses to Defendants Shasta Technologies, Inc. and Conductive Technologies, Inc.' evidentiary objections to the Declarations of Ty Lee and Erich Joachimsthaler (ECF Nos. 32-33 ("Objections")). See ECF No. 42 ("Stipulation"). January 28, 2013 is the due date for Plaintiffs' reply brief in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. See ECF No. 41.

The Objections were originally filed by Defendants Shasta Technologies, Inc., and Conductive Technologies, Inc. as two separate documents to be considered in connection with those Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. See ECF No. 27. Defendants Pharmatech Solutions, Inc. and Decision Diagnostics Corp. filed a separate Opposition. See ECF No. 29. After Defendants filed their Oppositions, the Court ordered that all Defendants file a single consolidated Opposition. See ECF No. 41. Based on the parties' Stipulation, the

ORDER DENYING STIPULATION RE: CASE SCHEDULING

Court surmises that all Defendants now wish that the Objections be considered in connection with Defendants' recently filed joint Opposition. See ECF No. 49.

Local Rule 7-3(b) provides that "[a]ny evidentiary and procedural objections to [a party's] motion must be contained within the [Opposition] brief or memorandum." Defendants' Objections are not contained in Defendants' joint Opposition but rather are contained in two separately filed documents, which constitute 15 pages of additional unauthorized briefing. Accordingly, the Court disregards Defendants' Objections. The parties' Stipulation seeking an order setting a deadline for Plaintiffs' response to the Objections is therefore DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 23, 2013

United States District Judge

cy H. Koh

Case No.: 12-CV-06360

¹ To the extent Defendants' joint Opposition brief contains evidentiary objections, the Court will consider these objections.